

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1 – 2 and 4 – 9 under 35 USC §102(a) as anticipated by Pettrash (EP 1086980). Applicants have canceled claims 1 – 6, leaving claims 7 – 9 falling under this rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse because Pettrash does not disclose a process that contains an in-line chlorination step. Although Pettrash states on page 9, lines 6-8, that chlorination or another coating may be used on the non-star polymer coated surface, there is no disclosure as to how this should be accomplished.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-24 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettrash in view of Momose (EP 03546580). Inasmuch as claims 1 – 6 and 20 – 24 are canceled, this rejection is pertinent to the remaining claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. The Examiner states that Momose discloses applicants' overall process. This is incorrect, as step 5 of figure 1 in Momose recites that the glove is removed from the mold (or former) before the chlorination process occurs. As can be seen from applicants' claims as now in the case, chlorination occurs while the glove is still on the former. With regard to Pettrash, there is no disclosure of an in-line chlorination step. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in these references, singly or combined, to motivate one to use an in-line chlorination process as claimed by applicants.

end of remarks